

EA



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,420	09/19/2003	Richard D. Fowler		7447

22442 7590 09/15/2005

SHERIDAN ROSS PC
1560 BROADWAY
SUITE 1200
DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

GREEN, BRIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3611

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/666,420

Applicant(s)

FOWLER ET AL.

Examiner

Brian K. Green

Art Unit

3611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I. in the reply filed on Jan. 10, 2005 is acknowledged.

Claim 20 has been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on Jan. 10, 2005.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the adhesive defined in claim 1 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will

Art Unit: 3611

be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gelsinger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,958,536) in view of Dronzek, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,543,191).

Gelsinger et al. shows in figures 1-2 a "shelf talker" comprising:

An adhesive layer (110) having upper and lower end portions (120,130) and first and second faces, said first face of said label sheet being adapted to have product information printed thereon, the label sheet having a line of weakness (see column 3, lines 20-25) formed within said label sheet intermediate the upper and lower end portions so the upper and lower end portions may be selectively separated from one another, and a liner sheet (160) operatively coupled to the adhesive and the second face of the label sheet. The first line of weakness (the vertical perforated line adjacent the lead line for numeral 130 in figure 2) is considered to extend completely between the upper and lower end portions since the line of weakness extends along substantially the entire length of the lower end portion. For example, the upper portion is considered to be the portion to the left of the first line of weakness, the lower end portion is considered to be the portion 130, i.e. the portion surrounded by the perforated line and the upper portion 140), and the outer edge portion (180) is considered to be a third portion. It is not clear

Art Unit: 3611

whether the adhesive layer (110)/label sheet of Gelsinger et al. includes a label sheet and an adhesive layer on the bottom surface of the label sheet. Dronzek shows in figures 1-3A that it is conventional to make an adhesive label in the form of a label sheet (8,10) having an adhesive on the bottom surface thereof, see column 4, lines 41-45. In view of the teachings of Dronzek it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Gelsinger et al. by making the adhesive layer (110) in the form of a label sheet having adhesive on the bottom surface of the label sheet since this would allow indicia to be printed on the adhesive layer (110) in an easier manner and would create a more durable and aesthetically pleasing label. In regard to claim 2, Gelsinger et al. discloses the use of a line of weakness (see column 3, lines 26-32) in the liner sheet to define a secondary liner. In regard to claim 3, Gelsinger et al. shows in figure 2 that the secondary liner (170) is located closely adjacent to the lower end portion. In regard to claims 4 and 5, Gelsinger et al. shows in figure 2 that the size and shape of the secondary liner (170) is approximately the shape and size of the lower end portion and slightly smaller, i.e. the liner 170 is smaller since the lower end portion (130) also includes an upper portion 140 which the liner does not include. In regard to claim 6, the label of Gelsinger et al. would work as disclosed in claim 6. In regard to claim 7, as broadly defined, the upper end portion of Gelsinger et al. would approximate the size of particular sized shelf, i.e. a shelf similar to the size shown in the applicant's figure 3. Further, it is considered within one skilled in the art to vary the particular size of the upper portion as desired, i.e. the size of the upper portion would be made based upon the size of the article in which the upper portion is going to be adhered to. In regard to claims 8 and 9, Dronzek, Jr. et al. discloses the idea of making the release liner from a non-curl material, i.e. polypropylene, see column 5, lines 15-25 and column 6, lines 9-34. In view of the teachings of Dronzek, Jr. et al. it

Art Unit: 3611

would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Gelsinger et al. by making the release liner from a non-curl material (polypropylene) since this would help to prevent the label and label sheet from curling which would allow the labels to be removed from a label sheet in an easier and faster manner and would allow the labels to be applied to a surface in an easier and faster manner. In regard to claim 10, the particular method used to print the information on the label is not a patentable feature in an article claim. In regard to claim 11, the particular indicia placed on the lower end portion is not a patentable feature, any type of information can be placed on the lower end as desired. In regard to claim 12, Gelsinger et al. does not disclose placing a plurality of label sheets on the liner. Dronzek, Jr. et al. shows in figure 1 the idea of placing a plurality of label sheets (4) onto a liner (6). In view of the teachings of Dronzek, Jr. et al. it would have been obvious to one in the art to modify Gelsinger et al. by placing a plurality of the label sheets onto the liner since this would allow a plurality of the label sheets to be held, transported, and stored in an easier and more convenient manner.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Korondi, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,702,127).

Korondi, Jr. shows in figures 1-3 a "shelf talker" comprising:

A label sheet (20) having upper and lower end portions (32 and 36 or 36 and 34) and first and second faces, said first face of said label sheet being adapted to have product information printed thereon, the label sheet having a line of weakness (40) formed within said label sheet extending completely between the upper and lower end portions and defining a line separating the upper and lower portions to the upper and lower portions are separated from one another when the label

Art Unit: 3611

sheet is broken along the first line of weakness, and a liner sheet (12) operatively coupled to the adhesive and the second face of the label sheet. The appliance upon which the label sheet is attached is considered to be the "object" and the lower end portion (36) extends vertically below the upper end portion and not in contact with the object.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 27, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that it is not necessary for the drawings to specifically illustrate the adhesive. The examiner disagrees since all claimed subject matter must be shown in the drawings, see MPEP 608.02(d) and 37 CFR 1.83.

The applicant argues that Gelsinger et al. fails to show a line of weakness, perforation, or any other type of breakage line which extends completely between the upper and lower end portions so that the upper and lower end portions are separated from one another when the label sheet is broken along the first line of weakness. The examiner disagrees since the first line of weakness (the vertical perforated line adjacent the lead line for numeral 130 in figure 2) is considered to extend completely between the upper and lower end portions since the line of weakness extends along substantially the entire length of the lower end portion. For example, the upper portion is considered to be the portion to the left of the first line of weakness, the lower end portion is considered to be the portion 130, i.e. the portion surrounded by the perforated lines and the upper portion 140), and the outer edge portion (180) is considered to be a third portion. Therefore, the first line of weakness in Gelsinger et al. is considered to extend completely

Art Unit: 3611

between the upper and lower “portions”. The applicant is reminded that the term “portion” is a broad term and any part of the label sheet can be considered a “portion”.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian K. Green whose telephone number is (571) 272-6644. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lesley Morris can be reached on (571) 272-6651. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


BRIAN K. GREEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Bkg
Sept. 13, 2005